

PATENT

REMARKS

The Office Action dated April 5, 2006 has been received and considered. In this response, claim 31 has been amended, claims 1-30 and 33-41 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 42-72 have been added. Support for the amendments may be found in the specification and drawings as originally filed. Reconsideration of the outstanding rejections in the present application is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Rejections of Claims 1-30 and 33-41

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Cheriton (U.S. Patent No. 6,831,917). At page 3 of the Office Action, claims 2, 3, 4, 9, 10, 11, 13, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Sachs (U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0080802). At page 5 of the Office Action, claims 6, 7, 12, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 34, 35, 36 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Wee (U.S. Patent Application 2002/0164018). At page 7 of the Office Action, claims 18, 19, 20, 37 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Wee and further in view of Sachs. At page 8 of the Office Action, claims 24, 25, 26, 28, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Aho (U.S. Patent No. 6,198,941). At page 10 of the Office Action, claims 30 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Aho and further in view of Wee. At page 10 of the Office Action, claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Aho and further in view of Sachs. At page 11 of the Office Action, claims 40 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Wee and further in view of Aho. Claims 1-30 and 33-41 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, thereby obviating their rejections. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejections of Claims 31 and 32

At page 8 of the Office Action, claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Aho. At page 10 of the Office Action, claim 32 is rejected

PATENT

under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheriton in view of Aho and further in view of Sachs. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

At page 10, the Office Action rejects claim 31 "on the same grounds as claim 24." It is respectfully submitted that claim 24 and claim 31 do not recite substantially similar combinations of features. Claim 24 (now canceled) recited the features of:

providing a first version of a video to a wireless display device at a first data transmission rate, wherein the first version includes a first resolution scale; negotiating a second data transmission rate with the wireless display device when a communication capability of the wireless display device changes; and providing a second version of the video to the wireless display device at the second data transmission rate, wherein the second version includes a second resolution scale different from the first resolution scale.

In contrast, claim 31 presently recites the features of:

determining at a display device a first data transmission rate between the display device and a wireless access point; determining at the display device a first channel of a plurality of channels of a multicast channel based on the first data transmission rate, wherein each channel of the plurality of channels is used to provide a different version of a plurality of versions of a video stream, and where each version of the video stream includes a different resolution scale; and accessing the first channel to receive a version of the video stream associated with the first channel.

Thus, claim 24 is directed to the process taken by a source of video to provide different versions of the video to a wireless display device, whereas claim 31 is directed to the process taken by a display device to determine which channel of a plurality of multicast channels to access to receive a corresponding version of a video stream. Accordingly, as claims 24 and 31 recite different features, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness in its rejection of claim 31 as it relies solely on the basis of its rejection of claim 24.

Further, the proposed combinations of Cheriton, Aho and Sachs fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claim 31. To illustrate, claim 31 recites the features of "determining at the display device a first channel of a plurality of channels of a multicast channel based on the first data transmission rate, wherein each channel of the plurality of channels is

PATENT

used to provide a different version of a plurality of versions of a video stream" and "accessing the first channel to receive a version of the video stream associated with the first channel."

Neither Cheriton, Aho, nor Sachs discloses or suggests a display device or any other receiver of video that determines which channel of a plurality of channels it is to access to receive a corresponding version of a video stream based on its data transmission rate as would be consistent with the subject matter of claim 31. Accordingly, the proposed combinations of Cheriton, Aho, and Sachs fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claim 31, as well as the additional features recited by claim 32 at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 31.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of claims 31 and 32 are improper. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections therefore is respectfully requested.

Addition of New Claims 42-72

New claims 42-72 have been added. Support for these claims can be found in the specification and figures as originally filed.

New claim 42, from which claims 43-52 depend, recites the features of:

receiving, at a video provider, a first connection information for a first networked display device;
receiving, at the video provider, a first request from the first networked display device for a video stream;
determining a first version of the video stream based on the first connection information; and
providing, in response to receiving the first request from the first networked display device, an indicator of a first multicast address from the video provider to the first networked display device, the first multicast address corresponding to a first transmission channel for the first version of the video stream.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, that a video provider receives first connection information from a first networked display device or that an indicator of a first multicast address is provided from the video provider to the first networked display device in response to receiving a first request from the first networked display device for

PATENT

a video stream as recited by claim 42. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, each and every feature recited by claim 42.

New claim 53, from which claims 54-57 depend, recites the features of:

determining a first data transmission rate of a wireless connection between a first wireless display device and an access point at a first time;
providing, at a second time subsequent to the first time, an indicator of a first wireless channel to the first wireless display device based on the first data transmission rate;
determining a second data transmission rate, different from the first data transmission rate, for the wireless connection at a third time subsequent to the second time;
providing, at a fourth time subsequent to the third time, an indicator of a second wireless channel to the first wireless display device based on the second data transmission rate;
transmitting a first version of a video stream via the first wireless channel; and
transmitting a second version of the video stream via the second wireless channel.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, that an indicator of a first wireless channel is provided to a first wireless display device based on a first data transmission rate and that an indicator of a second wireless channel is provided to the first wireless display device based on a second data transmission rate. The cited references therefore fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, each and every feature recited by claim 53.

New claim 58, from which claims 59-63 depend, recites the features of:

determining, at a networked display device, a first data transmission rate of a transmission connection of the networked display device at a first time;
determining, at the networked display device, a first multicast address from a plurality of multicast addresses based on the first data transmission rate, each of the plurality of multicast addresses associated with a corresponding version of a plurality of versions of a video stream; and
receiving, at the networked display device, a first version of the plurality of versions of the video stream via the transmission connection using the first multicast address for a first duration.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, a networked display device that determines a first data transmission rate and determines a first multicast address from a plurality of multicast addresses based on the first data transmission rate.

Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, each and every feature recited by claim 58.

New claim 64, from which claims 65-72 depend, recites the features of:

a video provider configured to:

receive a first connection information for a first networked display device and a first request for a video stream from the first networked display device; determine a first version of the video stream based on the first connection information; and

provide, in response to receiving the first request for the video stream from the first networked display device, an indicator of a first multicast address to the first networked display device, the first multicast address corresponding to a first transmission channel for the first version of the video stream.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, a video provider that receives first connection information from a first networked display device, determines a first version of the video stream based on the first connection information, and provides an indicator of a first multicast address to the first networked display device, the first multicast address corresponding to a first transmission channel for the first version of the video stream. Accordingly, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, each and every feature recited by claim 64.

In addition to failing to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by independent claims 42, 53, 58, and 64, the cited references also fail to disclose or suggest the additional features recited by their dependent claims. To illustrate, dependent claim 52 recites the additional features of:

receiving, at the video provider, display resolution information for the first networked display device;

wherein the first connection information includes a data transmission rate of a connection between the video provider and the first networked display device; and

wherein determining the first version of the identified video stream comprises selecting the first version from a plurality of versions of the identified video stream based on the data transmission rate and the display resolution information.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest, individually or in combination, that display resolution information for a first networked display device is received at a video

PATENT

provider, or that determining a first version of an identified video stream comprises selecting the first version based on a data transmission rate and the display resolution information.

Accordingly, the cited references also fail to disclose each and every feature recited by claim 52.

As another example, dependent claim 61 recites the features of:

wherein determining the first multicast address comprises performing a table lookup based on the first data transmission rate.

The cited references fail to disclose or suggest that a first multicast address is determined by performing a table lookup based on a first data transmission rate. The cited references therefore also fail to disclose or suggest each and every feature recited by claim 61.

Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants believe no additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 50-1835.

Respectfully submitted,



Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596
LARSON NEWMAN ABEL POLANSKY & WHITE, LLP
5914 West Courtyard Dr., Suite 200
Austin, Texas 78730
(512) 439-7100 (phone)
(512) 439-7199 (fax)

7 August 2006
Date